



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/075,424	07/26/97	HENRICSON	R 30-440

NIXON & VANDERHYE
1100 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
8TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON VA 22201

IM71/1115

EXAMINER	
ALVIN M	ART UNIT
	PAPER NUMBER

12

DATE MAILED:

11/15/99

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

**NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE
REQUIREMENTS OF 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)**

The response to Notification of Non-Compliance is being treated as a request for reconsideration as set forth under 37 CFR 1.181.

Applicant has merely restated the limitations in the dependent claims and stated that it would not be obvious to modify the references to teach "these features". This is nothing more than "merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover", it "is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable" as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c). For Example, in the Final rejection it was stated that "The use of two peroxide stages would have been obvious as WO 94/20674 teaches that additional bleach stages could be followed with one of the following stages (E, P, Eo, Ep, Eop, page 12, lines 13-21) and could be further supplemented by using a P, D and/or H stage during the sequence (claims 19 and 33)" emphasis added. Appellant has not argued why it would not have been obvious to use the chlorine dioxide (D-stage) of WO 94/20674 in the bleach sequence. Claim 17 claims the conditions of the acid stage. The final

has not argued why the conditions of claim 17 differ or are not obvious over page 5 of WO 94/20674. Claim 21 calls for treating with hydrogen peroxide alone or by adding hydrogen peroxide to an alkaline stage. The final rejection points out that WO 94/20674 teaches that additional bleach stages could be followed with one of the following stages (E, P, Eo, Ep, Eop, page 12, lines 13-21). Appellant has not pointed out why this would not be obvious. The limitations of the other dependent claims have been discussed in the final rejection. Appellant has given any reasons as to how these dependent claims differ over the applied art.

Appellant states that the rejection of claims 36-46 only appears in the cover page. However, the final rejection, page 3, lines 4+ reject claims 36-46. Omitting these claims on page 2 of the final rejection was an error. However they were clearly rejected as evidenced by page 3 and the cover letter.

The Appeal Brief filed 8-23-99 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR § 1.192(c). See 1173 O.G. 62, April 11, 1995.

37 CFR § 1.192(c) requires the following items to be included in the appellant's brief:

(1) *Real party in interest.* A statement identifying the real party in interest, if the party named in the caption of the brief is not the real party in interest.

(2) *Related appeals and interferences.* A statement identifying by number and filing date all other appeals or interferences known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) *Status of claims.* A statement of the status of all the claims, pending or canceled, and identifying the claims appealed.

Art Unit: 1731

(4) *Status of amendments.* A statement of the status of any amendment filed subsequent to final rejection.

(5) *Summary of invention.* A concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

(6) *Issues.* A concise statement of the issues presented for review.

(7) *Grouping of claims.* For each ground of rejection which appellant contests and which applies to a group of two or more claims, the Board shall select a single claim from the group and shall decide the appeal as to the ground of rejection on the basis of that claim alone unless a statement is included that the claims of the group do not stand or fall together and, in the argument under paragraph (c)(8) of this section, appellant explains why the claims of the group are believed to be separately patentable. Merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable.

(8) *Argument.* The contentions of appellant with respect to each of the issues presented for review in paragraph (c)(6) of this section, and the basis therefor, with citations of the authorities, statutes, and parts of the record relied on. Each issue should be treated under a separate heading.

(I) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and how the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is complied with, including, as appropriate, how the specification and drawings, if any,

(A) describe the subject matter defined by each of the rejected claims,

(B) enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the subject matter defined by each of the rejected claims, and

(C) set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his or her invention.

(ii) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and how the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(iii) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and why the rejected claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102, including any specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied upon in the rejection.

Art Unit: 1731

(iv) For each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and, if appropriate, the specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied on in the rejection, and shall explain how such limitations render the claimed subject matter unobvious over the prior art. If the rejection is based upon a combination of references, the argument shall explain why the references, taken as a whole, do not suggest the claimed subject matter, and shall include, as may be appropriate, an explanation of why features disclosed in one reference may not properly be combined with features disclosed in another reference. A general argument that all the limitations are not described in a single reference does not satisfy the requirements of this paragraph.

(v) For any rejection other than those referred to in paragraphs (c)(8)(I) to (iv) of this section, the argument shall specify the errors in the rejection and the specific limitations in the rejected claims, if appropriate, or other reasons, which cause the rejection to be in error.

(9) *Appendix*. An appendix containing a copy of the claims involved in the appeal.

Applicant does not include claims 36-46 under "ISSUES" and thus does not comply with paragraph 6 above.

The Brief on Appeal filed 8-23-99 does not comply with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)(7) because the brief contains the statement that all of the claims are independently distinct from each other but, in the arguments appellant does not explain why all the claim are believed to be separately patentable. Merely pointing out differences in what the claims cover is not an argument as to why the claims are separately patentable.

Appellant is required to comply with provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c). APPLICANT IS GIVEN A TIME LIMIT OF ONE MONTH FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER OR ANY TIME REMAINING IN THE PERIOD UNDER 37 CFR 1.192(a) FOR FILING A NEW COMPLETE BRIEF. If a new brief that fully complies with 37 CFR 1.192(c) is not timely

Art Unit: 1731

submitted, the appeal will be dismissed as of the date of expiration of the period provided by 37 CFR 1.192(a). No extension of this one month time limit may be obtained under either 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) but the original two-month period under 37 CFR 1.192(a) for filing the brief may be extended under 37 CFR 1.136(a) up to six months from the date of the Notice of Appeal.

A proper response to this letter would be a Petition, or new brief complying with 37 CFR 1.192.

When filing an **“Official” FAX** in Art Unit 1731, please indicate in the Header (upper right) **“Official”** for papers that are to be entered into the file. The **“Official” FAX** phone number for this Art Unit is **(703) 305-7718** for all papers except amendments after final, for amendments after final the FAX number is 703-305-3599. When filing an **“Unofficial” FAX** in Group 1730, please indicate in the Header (upper right) **“Unofficial”** for Draft Documents and other Communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers. The **“Unofficial” FAX** phone number for this Art Unit (1731) is **(703) 305-7115**.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the **primary examiner** should be directed to **Steve Alvo** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-2048**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from **6:30 AM - 3:00 PM (EST)**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 703-308-3837.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Group receptionist** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-0661**.



STEVE ALVO
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1731

MSA
November 8, 1999